

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-44 are pending in this application. Claims 36-44 are added by the present response. Claims 26-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 26-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,764,736 to Shachar et al. (herein "Shachar") in view of U.S. patent 6,512,525 to Capps et al. (herein "Capps"). The above-noted rejections are traversed by the present response as discussed next.

First, with respect to the rejection of Claims 26-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, applicant initially notes the objected to language is no longer recited in the independent claims, but is now presented in new dependent claims 37, 39, and 41. Those claims also now clarify that language by initially referring to displaying "a list of telephone numbers including said telephone number". The newly recited claim language is believed to address the rejection of claims 26-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 26-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shachar in view of Capps, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to now further recite "wherein when said designation indicates the predetermined apparatus is the computer, a processing is carried out to communicate with the computer".

New dependent claims 36, 38, and 40 now further recite "wherein the processing carried out to communicate with the computer includes establishing a communication link with the computer, and transmitting an identification and password to the computer".

New dependent claims 37, 40, and 43 are also added herein that further recite "wherein when the designation indicates the predetermined apparatus is the WWW server, a

processing is carried to communicate with the WWW server”. That subject matter is shown in the original specification for example at Figure 6A, step S28 and in Figure 7.

The subject matter now recited in each of the independent claims directed to carrying out a processing to communicate with the computer is noted in the original specification for example at Figure 6A, step S30. The subject matter in new dependent claims 36, 38, and 40 is shown for example in Figure 9 in the present specification. The claimed features are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The claims as currently written recite a receiver configured to receive information transmitted by an information providing apparatus that includes a designation “indicating whether the predetermined apparatus is any one of a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, and a telephone apparatus”.

With respect to the above-noted features, the claims are directed to an information processing apparatus or method in which a receiver receives information transmitted by an information providing apparatus. That information includes a telephone number assigned to a line connected to a predetermined apparatus and a designation of a communication method defining a communication with the predetermined apparatus. As recited in the claims “the designation indicat[es] whether the predetermined apparatus is any one of a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus”. The claims also recite utilizing that designation to establish a communication link with the predetermined apparatus. Specifically the claims recite the communication controller or controlling operation “determines whether the designation indicates the WWW server, the FAX-information apparatus, the computer, and the telephone apparatus”.

The claims now even further clarify the connection can be made to the computer, and when the designation indicates the predetermined apparatus is a computer processing is carried out to communicate with the computer.

According to the above-noted features recited in the claims, a designation of a communication method can indicate several of different communications methods depending on whether the predetermined apparatus to communicate with is any one of a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus. Even more particularly, with reference to Figure 6A in the present specification, in the claimed invention operations such as shown in steps S22-S24, S27-S30, and S33 are executed. Specifically, in steps S22-S25 and S27 it is determined whether the designation indicates the communication partner is a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus. If Yes in any of those steps S22-S24 and S27, then the operation proceeds to a respective of steps S28-S30 and S33 in which an appropriate communication protocol is designated based on whether the designation indicates communication to a WWW server, a FAX apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus.

The above-noted features recited in the claims are believed to distinguish over the prior art.

The primary reference to Shachar notes a communication in which information received can indicate an alternative network address.<sup>1</sup> However, Shachar does not disclose or suggest the features recited in the claims of the designation indicating whether the predetermined apparatus is any one of a “WWW server, a FAX information apparatus, a computer, and a telephone apparatus.” Further, Shachar does not disclose or suggest any operation such as shown for example in steps S21-S24, and S27, and S28-S30 and S33 in which the designation indicates communication in any of the WWW server, FAX apparatus, computer, or telephone apparatus, and then selects appropriate communication protocols based on whether the predetermined apparatus is any one of the WWW server, the FAX-information apparatus, the computer, or the telephone apparatus.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example Shachar at column 13, lines 16 *et seq.*

With respect to the above-noted features the outstanding rejection now appears to cite Shachar at column 13, line 61 to column 14, line 20.<sup>2</sup>

In reply to that grounds for rejection applicant notes noted disclosure in Shachar discloses being able to indicate an “alternate network connection”. However, that disclosure in Shachar is not at all directed to the claimed features.

As noted above, in the claims a communication controller can determine whether a designation of a predetermined apparatus for communication with is “any one of a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus”. The claims now even further clarify that when that designation indicates a computer a processing is carried out to communicate with the computer. Being able to make an “alternate network connection” in Shachar is not directed to any such features. More particularly, the “alternate network connection” in Shachar does not provide a designation between any one of a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, and a telephone apparatus. Such an “alternate network connection” also does not make a specific processing to communicate with the computer when the designation indicates the predetermined apparatus to be communicated with is a computer.

In such ways, the reliance on Shachar with respect to such claimed features is traversed.

Applicants also draw attention to new dependent claims 37, 40, and 43 that further recite “wherein when the designation indicates the predetermined apparatus is the WWW server, a processing is carried out to communicate with the WWW server”. Such features are believed to also further distinguish over Shachar. The above-noted “alternate network connection” in Shachar, as discussed above, does not even provide a designation of a WWW server, and thus clearly Shachar does not disclose or suggest a processing being carried to

---

<sup>2</sup> Office Action of January 7, 2008, the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6.

communicate with the WWW server when a designation of the WWW server is indicated.  
Thus, new dependent claims 37, 40, and 43 even further distinguish over the applied art to Shachar.

Moreover, no teachings in Capps or the Official Notice were cited with respect to the above-noted features, and no teachings in Capps or the Official Notice are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies in Shachar.

Thereby, in view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)  
SNS/rac

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423